

## REMARKS

Claims 21-44 are pending and stand rejected. In response, claims 21, 29, and 37 are amended and claims 22-23, 30-31, and 38-39 are canceled. Claims 21, 24-29, 32-37, and 40-41 remain pending upon entry of this amendment.

Claims 23, 31 and 39 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. In response, Applicant has canceled these claims, thereby obviating their rejections.

Claims 21-22, 26-30, 34-38, and 42-44 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Barber, US Patent 6,915,433, in view of EP 924630 to More Magic Software (hereinafter MMS). Claims 23-25, 31-33, and 39-41 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Barber, in view of MMS, further in view of Kaufman, US Patent 6,178,508. Applicant discusses these rejections together for purposes of clarity and respectfully traverses the rejections as applied to the amended claims.

Independent claim 21 now recites:

providing a memory storing meta-data, the **meta-data defining resource access rights of the process** and initially having a null value in a field;  
receiving a request from the process to authenticate a user;  
authenticating the user responsive to the request from the process; and  
responsive to a positive authentication of the user, altering the meta-data in the memory by substituting the null value in the field with an identification of the user, the substitution **providing the process with a set of resource access rights defined for the process.**

Claims 29 and 37 recite similar elements. Claim limitations related to meta-data initially having a null value and altering the meta-data by substituting the null value with an identification of the user were previously recited by claims 22, 30, and 38.

In the claimed invention, resource access rights are determined at the process level and defined by meta-data. The meta-data initially have a null value in a field, resulting in the process having no or limited rights. Once a user is authenticated, the null field of the meta-data is altered to include the user identification. This alteration provides the process with a set of defined resource access rights. The claimed invention thus recites using a process-based security method bound together with user identification.

The Examiner acknowledges that Barber does not disclose meta-data defining resource access rights but asserts that MMS remedies this deficiency (Office Action, Par. 8). Specifically, the Examiner asserts that MMS discloses meta-data defining resource access rights at paragraphs 0022 and 0024.

Applicant respectfully submits that MMS neither teaches nor suggests meta-data defining resource access rights *of a process*, as claimed. MMS teaches a method of downloading resources to a client from a content server. MMS uses header information in the resource to describe access rights to the resource itself. See, e.g., para. 22, lines 28-29, where MMS states that the access (header) information relates “to the requested web page.” The claimed invention, in contrast to MMS, recites meta-data describing access rights of a *process* seeking access to a resource. Applicant respectfully submits that MMS in no way teaches the independent claims’ recitations of meta-data defining resource access rights *of the process*.

Kaufman does not remedy the deficiencies of Barber or MMS discussed above, but instead teaches protecting an encrypted data file with cryptographically hashed passwords. Accordingly, Barber does not disclose, at the least, the above-identified limitation, and this deficiency is not remedied by MMS or Kaufman. Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that a person of ordinary skill in the art, considering the teachings of Barber, MMS, and

Kaufman, either alone or in combination, would not find the invention recited by independent claims 21, 29, and 37 obvious. The dependent claims incorporate the limitations of their respective base claims and are patentable for at least the same reasons. Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that the pending claims are patentable over the cited references.

For at least the reasons stated above, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 21, 24-29, 32-37, and 40-44 are in condition for allowance. Issuance of the Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested. The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned to advance the prosecution of this case.

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED,

Date: January 29, 2007

By: /Pierre Keeley/

Pierre Keeley, Reg. No. 57,045  
FENWICK & WEST LLP  
801 California Street  
Mountain View, CA 94041  
Phone: (650) 335-7242  
Fax: (650) 938-5200